REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank Examiner Leynna Truvan for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative Jacob M. Ward, Reg. No. 56,754, during the telephone interview on April 27, 2010. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that incorporation of dependent Claims 22, 23, and 30 into independent Claims 21 and 31 would distinguish the claimed invention over the art of Allen and Nendell. Applicants agreed to submit the amendments to the claims in the present response for the Examiner's further search and consideration. The Examiner's careful consideration of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Claims 21, 24-29, and 31 remain in the application.

Claims 22-23 and 30 have been cancelled.

Claims 21 and 31 have been amended.

Support for the amendments is found in the application as originally filed. The subject matter of cancelled Claims 22-23 and 30 has been incorporated into independent Claims 21 and 31.

No new matter has been added.

In the nonfinal Office Action mailed February 19, 2010, Claims 21-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,000,505) and further in view of Nendell (U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,361).

The invention as recited in amended independent Claim 21 includes a method of initiating a procedure within a building. The method comprises the steps of:

a. defining at least one initiating event for the procedure which event does not involve a person arriving at the building;
b. defining at least one security requirement for the procedure;
c. defining at least one person to be authorized to perform the procedure;
d. detecting the occurrence of the at least one initiating event wherein the at least one person does not define the at least one initiating event and does not cause the occurrence of the at least one initiating event;
e. generating a virtual key for the at least one person based on the at least one security requirement upon detecting the occurrence of the at least one initiating event and prior to the at least one person

arriving at the building, wherein the step of generating the virtual key includes the steps of assigning an encrypted code to the virtual key, and adding a signature to the virtual key;

f. transmitting the virtual key to the at least one person using wireless devices;

g. detecting use of the virtual key by the at least one person in the building;

h. checking the validity of the virtual key, including identifying the at least one person as a recipient of the transmitted virtual key by the signature;

i. initiating the procedure within the building if the validity check is positive wherein initiating the procedure consists of performing at least one of the steps of: opening of at least one door of the building; making at least one elevator available; opening of at least one elevator door; and release of any security barriers which may be present; and

j. performing said steps a. through i. in an access control computer system associated with the building.

The invention as recited in amended independent Claim 31 includes substantially the same limitations as amended independent Claim 21, but further recites "defining . . . an availability requirement for the procedure" in step b. of the method.

Allen describes an elevator system operable as emergency egress and evacuation during a fire incident. Upon detection of a fire incident in a building, a communication mechanism sends a detection signal and a status signal to a remote fire department. (Allen at col. 6, lines 1-7). The Examiner had cited Allen as teaching steps a.-d. and j. of the method recited in previously presented independent Claims 21 and 31. (Nonfinal Office Action at pages 3 and 4).

Nendell was cited as teaching a "virtual key". (Nonfinal Office Action at pages 3 and 4). Nendell is directed to methods for verifying and authenticating the identity of participants in electronic communication with one another. (Nendell at Abstract).

As agreed upon during the above-mentioned interview, the combination of Allen and Nendell fails to teach or suggest the steps of "wherein the step of generating the virtual key includes the steps of **assigning an encrypted code to the virtual key, and adding a signature to the virtual key**", "f. transmitting the virtual key to the at least one person **using wireless devices**;", and "h. checking the validity of the virtual key,

including **identifying the at least one person as a recipient of the transmitted virtual key by the signature**". Accordingly, amended independent Claims 21 and 31 and claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited combination of Allen and Nendell.

It is also respectfully submitted that neither Allen nor Nendell teach or suggest the steps of "defining at least one security requirement for the procedure" and "generating a virtual key . . . based on the at least one security requirement", as recited in the independent claims. Applicants have described the advantage of these steps at paragraph [0021] of the original application, which states:

> **[0021]** The type of event determines what requirements are specified for a key that is to be generated. For example, if a fire occurs in the building, the requirements for the security of the key must be set less high and the requirements for the availability of the key must be set higher. If, however, the initiating event is giving to a cleaning service the task of cleaning the building, the security requirements for the key to be issued must be set significantly higher. **This means that in this case, the danger of misusing the key must be kept as low as possible, whereas in case of fire, access to the building must be guaranteed under all circumstances. In consequence, different types of events place different requirements on the key to be issued in a processing step** "Specify Requirements for the Key" 12.
>
> (Emphasis added).

Allen at col. 3, lines 52-62, and col. 9, lines 25-30, identified as teaching the "at least one security requirement", merely describes security measures that automatically occur when a fire is detected, e.g., causing all elevators to go to a predetermined floor, closing fire doors, etc. It should also be recognized that the virtual keys generated by Nendell are not based on a pre-defined security requirement for a procedure to be initiated within a building. For these further reasons, Claims 21, 24-29, and 31 are patentable over the art of record.

Applicants further respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Nendell with Allen. Nendell has nothing to do with initiating a procedure within a building. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to the

teachings of Nendell to modify the elevator system of Allen. For this additional reason, the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the amended claims distinctly define Applicants' invention and distinguish the same from the art of record. A formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner deem that other language would be more appropriate, it is requested that a telephone interview be had with the Applicants' attorney in a sincere effort to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Clemens, Reg. No. 26,855
(248) 960-2100
Jacob M. Ward, Reg. No. 56,754
(419) 874-1100

Fraser Clemens Martin & Miller LLC
28366 Kensington Lane
Perrysburg, Ohio 43551-4163
419-874-1100
419-874-1130 (FAX)

15632